



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,809	03/05/2002	Cordell R. Ratzlaff	8360.1587-00	2977

826 7590 07/18/2007  
ALSTON & BIRD LLP  
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA  
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000  
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER
----------

CHOI, PETER H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/18/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/087,809	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RATZLAFF ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Peter Choi	<b>Art Unit</b> 3623	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 26, 2007 has been entered.

2. The following is a **NON-FINAL** office action upon examination of application number 10/087809. Claims 1-16 are pending in the application and have been examined on the merits discussed below.

### ***Response to Amendment***

3. Claims 1, 6, and 12-16 have been amended.

4. The previous rejection of claims 12-16 raised under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph and 35 U.S.C. 101, are withdrawn in view of claim amendments submitted April 26, 2007.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed April 26, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the claimed invention requires that the received dates be compared and the chronological relationship therebetween be determined after being entered, whereas Forbes simply discloses inputting a start and an end time.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner asserts that Forbes does indeed compare the first date and the second date to determine a chronological relationship. The Applicant has not set forth a special definition for "date"; thus, use of the term "date" is understood to be a reference to a commonly accepted definition for said term. Date is defined as "the time at which an event occurs" or "an appointment to meet at a specified time" (see Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, 10<sup>th</sup> Edition, reference 1-U). In Forbes, the user specifies and inputs the start time of the event, and either a duration or an end time to the event [Column 8, lines 30-33]. The chronological relationship between the start and end time of a single event is evident in that one time is the start time of said event, chronologically occurring prior to the end time of said event, as determined by checking that the starting time of the event occurs before the end of the range of time selected by the user ( $\text{event.start} \leq \text{range.end}$ ) and determining that the end time of the event occurs after the start of the range of time selected by the user ( $\text{event.end} \geq \text{range.start}$ ) [Column 6, lines 1-9]. Further, the Examiner asserts that the comparison presented above cannot occur until after signals designating the first and second dates have been received; thus, the Examiner asserts that Forbes does indeed teach the step of comparing the first and second date to

determine a chronological relationship after receiving the signals designating the respective dates.

Applicant argues that Forbes does not teach or suggest modifying the start time or end time based on when the set start time was received in relation to the set end time.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant's assertion does not clearly point out the patentable novelty that he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. It is unclear how the order in which the start and end dates are entered affects the modification of a start or end time of an event range. The Examiner also notes that the Applicant has not disclosed that the modification of start or end times based on when the start time was received in relation to the end time solves any stated problem, is used for a particular purpose nor provides any advantage. Further, Forbes would have been expected by those of ordinary skill in the art to perform equally well by modifying event start and end times based on the most recently entered input because doing so would yield a smarter, faster, more efficient interface for event planning.

As cited by the Examiner, and acknowledged by the Applicant, Forbes allows users to manipulate a timecell to reflect a schedule change. Forbes allows users to change the start and end times of scheduled events. Placement of the cursor in the

Art Unit: 3623

left portion of the timebar indicates an intent to change the start time, placement in the right portion of the timebar indicates an intent to change the end time. A plus-minus cursor is used to indicate the timebar can have its start time changed, or a minus-plus cursor to indicate the timebar can have its end time changed [Column 8, lines 43-43, and 51-53]. For example, if an event had been scheduled to start at 9 AM and end at 11 AM, the user could modify the event to start at 10 AM, or end at 10 AM. If the left portion of the timebar is manipulated, then a new start time has been received and set.

Similarly, if the right portion of a timebar is manipulated, then a new end time has been received and set. Further, the claimed invention is directed towards modifying a start or end date for an event range after initial start and end dates have been set, a function performed by Forbes. Forbes checks that the starting time of the event occurs before the end of the range of time selected by the user ( $\text{event.start} \leq \text{range.end}$ ) and determining that the end time of the event occurs after the start of the range of time selected by the user ( $\text{event.end} \geq \text{range.start}$ ) [Column 6, lines 1-9]. Furthermore, the Examiner asserts that modifying either the initial input, or the most recent input is old and well known in the computing arts. By modifying only the initial input, users would not be required to re-enter all subsequent inputs if no modification to said subsequent inputs are required. By modifying only the most recent input, users would not be required to re-enter all previous inputs. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the end time when the start date was selected first because doing so would yield a smarter, faster, more efficient interface for

event planning. Thus, the Examiner asserts that Forbes performs the end result of modifying the start or end time of an event range.

Applicant argues that Forbes does not disclose that the user may interact with a calendar or otherwise select dates on the calendar. Applicant also argues that the calendar depicted in Figure 7 of Forbes is only for displaying events that are already scheduled rather than actually using the calendar as an interface for selecting dates to determine an event range.

The Examiner respectfully disagrees. The Examiner notes that the preamble of claim 12 recites that the computer-readable instructions stored on a data processing system, is merely configured to perform a plurality of steps; however the system does not actually require the plurality of steps to be performed. Use of the phrase “configured to” implies the ability to so perform, and not a positive recitation of a performed function.

Further, Forbes depicts the placement of an event in time by providing a display of a standard Gregorian calendar on which tasks previously scheduled on certain days are shown (i.e., a monthly calendar graphical interface) [Figure 7, Column 2, lines 63-54]. The determination of a time frame for scheduling an event is provided for the user by a display which depicts days on which events are scheduled (i.e., view selected event ranges) by boldface, larger font size, or other highlighting techniques. To identify the need and capability to schedule additional events, the user can display a table of

Art Unit: 3623

possible events to be scheduled and select events from this table (i.e., select dates to schedule a selected event based on available timeframes). Display of the provided Gregorian calendar graphically depicts scheduling timeframes as well as identifies days on which events are already scheduled [Column 8, lines 18-22 and 59-64]. Further, as presented by the Applicant, Figure 7 of Forbes depicts scheduling timeframes as well as identifying days on which events are already scheduled. By viewing a calendar of available (and unavailable) days, a user may select a range of dates for an event. For example, if June 1-10 are identified as being unavailable (as a result of already having events scheduled during those days), then the user would not be able to select any of the unavailable days to fall between a range of dates for an event (for example, June 3<sup>rd</sup> could not be chosen as a start date, end date, or a date lying in between the start and end dates). The claim language of claim 12 recites that the monthly calendar interface is for users to select event ranges, but does not require that the monthly calendar interface allows users to actually schedule events. The "selection" step may be limited to the mind of the user. Using the earlier example, upon being presented with a calendar for June, the user would not schedule an event to start, end, or occur June 1-10; rather, the presentation of the June calendar would lead the user to select another range of dates in which to schedule an event. Thus, the Examiner maintains the assertion that Forbes provides a monthly calendar graphical interface that allows users to select dates and view selected event ranges.



6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 3-4, and 7-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 recite conditional claim limitations. Conditional clauses (i.e., "if", "when") are used in defining the claimed invention.

For example, claim 3 sets the new date as a new start date if the new date chronologically precedes the start date for an event range. It is unclear what happens if the new date does not chronologically precede the start date; specifically, it is unclear if the limitation (setting the new date as a new start date) is performed if the conditional statement is not satisfied.

Similar defects occur in claims 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. Clarification is required.

Claim 11 recites the limitations "the set start date" and "the set end date" in line 7. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 11 specifies a "start date" and an "end date", sets a first date as a "start date" and sets a second date as an "end date". It is unclear whether the limitation "the set start date" is a reference to the first date, which has been set as a start date, or if it is a reference to

Art Unit: 3623

another "set start date". Similarly, it is unclear whether the limitation "the set end date" is a reference to the second date, which has been set as an end date, or if it is a reference to another "set end date". Clarification is required.

The preamble of claim 12 recites that the computer-readable instructions stored on a data processing system, is merely **configured** to perform a plurality of steps; however the system does not actually require the plurality of steps to be performed. Use of the phrase "configured to" implies the ability to so perform, and is not a positive recitation of a performed function. It is unclear whether the claimed invention, as defined by independent claim 12, actually performs the steps it is "configured to" perform. Clarification is required.

Claims 13-16 are dependent on claim 12 and thus are also rejected.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

9. Claims 1-3, 6-8, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Forbes et al. (US Patent # 5,659,768).

As per claim 1, Forbes et al. teaches a method for designating dates in an interactive travel calendar comprising:

(a) providing an interface for users to select event ranges (**events to be scheduled are input by a user into the invention's data base using a variety of readily available input devices; manipulation of the information is begun by selecting data by pointing the device cursor to "select" timebars or times for an event**), each event range having a start date that chronologically precedes an end date (**user specifies and inputs the start time of the event and an end time to the event**)

[Column 3, lines 50-63, Column 8, lines 30-33, Figures 1-8];

(b) receiving a signal designating a first date associated with an event (**user specifies and inputs the start time of the event and an end time to the event**)

[Column 8, lines 30-33];

(c) receiving a signal designating a second date associated with an event (**user specifies and inputs the start time of the event and an end time to the event**)

[Column 8, lines 30-33];

(d) compare the first date and the second date to determine a chronological relationship between the first and the second date **{It is understood that chronologically, one time/date occurs prior to the other time/date; thus, the first occurring time/date for an event is the start date, as a result of the chronological relationship with the other (end) time/date for an event}**, wherein the first and second dates are compared after receiving the respective first and second signals

Art Unit: 3623

designating the first and second dates **{a comparison cannot be performed until receiving the first and second dates}** [Column 6, lines 1-9];

(e) determine a start date for an event range **(the user specifies and inputs the start time of the event, and either a duration or an end time to the event)** [Column 8, lines 30-33] based upon the chronological relationship between the first date and the second date, with the start date being the date earlier chronologically among the first and second date and the end date being the date chronologically later among the first and second date **{the chronological relationship between the start and end time of a single event is evident in that one time is the start time of said event, chronologically occurring prior to the end time of said event. It is understood that chronologically, one time/date occurs prior to the other time/date; thus, the first occurring time/date for an event is the start date, as a result of the chronological relationship with the other (end) time/date for an event}**; and

(f) presenting information reflecting the event range **(By specifying a timescale and a starting date for the display, the user would cause the invention to display a series of timebars uniquely identified as representing particular events over a scrollable grid with time increments over the calendar period specified; Display of the provided Gregorian calendar graphically depicts scheduling timeframes as well as identifies days on which events are already scheduled)** [Column 8, lines 34-38, 61-64, Figures 1-8].

As per claim 2, Forbes et al. teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

(a) receiving a signal designating a new date associated with the event **(the user communicates the user's intention to manipulate the timebar by placement of the pointer on the timebar)** [Column 5, lines 40-41, Column 8, lines 41-43]; and

(b) setting the new date as a new end date based on a determination that the new date chronologically succeeds the end date for the event range to form a new event range **(placement of the pointer on the right end of a timebar communicates the intent to change the end time)** [Column 5, lines 43-45, Column 8, lines 44-46].

As per claim 3, Forbes et al. teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

(a) receiving a signal designating a new date associated with the event **(the user communicates the user's intention to manipulate the timebar by placement of the pointer on the timebar)** [Column 5, lines 40-41, Column 8, lines 41-43]; and

(b) setting the new date as a new start date if the new date chronologically precedes the start date for the event range to form a new event range **(placement of the pointer on the left end of a timebar communicates the intent to change the start time)** [Column 5, lines 42-43, Column 8, lines 43-44].

Claims 6-8 recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claims 1-3 above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

As per claim 12, Forbes et al. teaches a data processing system having computer-readable instructions stored therein for generating a graphical user interface

Art Unit: 3623

for selecting dates in an interactive calendar, the computer-readable instructions, when executed, configured to **(Forbes is run on any standard “IBM” ® compatible personal computer having the various generation of Intel® microprocessors and cathode ray tube, liquid crystal, or other type of display) [Column 3, lines 39-45, 53-54]:**

(a) generate an initial view including a monthly calendar interface **(display of the provided Gregorian calendar graphically depicts scheduling timeframes as well as identifies days on which events are already scheduled)** for users to select event ranges, each event range having a start date that chronologically precedes an end date, wherein upon receiving a signal designating a first date and a second date associated with an event, the first date or the second date is designated as a start date for an event range based upon a chronological relationship between the first date and the second date, with the one of the first and second date that is chronologically before the other set as the start date, and the other date set as the end date **(user specifies and inputs the start time of the event and an end time to the event)** [Column 8, lines 30-33, 61-63]; and

(b) a new view including a monthly calendar interface presenting information reflecting the event range **(When the pointing device is dragged over the timebar a gray outline of the timebar movies in proportion to the pointing device movement. As the timebar is moved, the table is updated for each time increment of motion. If the timebar is being repositioned, both the start and end times are highlighted and updated continually with each minute of motion. If the timebar is being**

**shortened or lengthened, only the start or the end time is highlighted and updated continually; By specifying a timescale and a starting date for the display, the user would cause the invention to display a series of timebars uniquely identified as representing particular events over a scrollable grid with time increments over the calendar period specified; Display of the provided Gregorian calendar graphically depicts scheduling timeframes as well as identifies days on which events are already scheduled)** [Column 7, lines 10-19, Column 8, lines 1-8, 34-38, 61-64, Figures 1-8].

Claims 13-14 recite limitations already addressed by the rejection of claims 2-3 (setting new start or end dates for an event) and 12 (monthly calendar interface allowing users to specify event ranges and present information reflecting the event range) above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 4-5, 9-11 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Forbes et al. (U.S Patent #5,659,768).

As per claim 4, Forbes et al. teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:

- (a) receiving a signal designating a new date associated with the event **(the user communicates the user's intention to manipulate the timebar by placement of the pointer on the timebar)** [Column 5, lines 40-46, Column 8, lines 41-43]; and
- (b) setting the new date as a new end date if the new date falls chronologically within the event range, to form a new event range **(a user can textually manipulate the timecells to reflect schedule adjustments)** [Column 5, lines 40-46, Column 6, lines 66-67].

Although Forbes et al. teaches the step of setting a new end date, Forbes et al. does not explicitly set modify the end date specifically because the start date was selected before the end date. However, Official Notice is taken that modifying the most recent input is old and well known in the computing arts. By modifying only the most recent input, users would not be required to re-enter all previous inputs. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the end time when the start date was selected first because doing so would yield a smarter, faster, more efficient interface for event planning.

As per claim 5, Forbes et al. teaches the method of claim 1, further comprising:



(a) receiving a signal designating a new date associated with the event **(the user communicates the user's intention to manipulate the timebar by placement of the pointer on the timebar)** [Column 5, lines 40-41, Column 8, lines 41-43]; and

(b) setting the new date as a new start date based on a determination that the new date falls chronologically within the event range, to form a new event range **(a user can textually manipulate the timecells to reflect schedule adjustments)** [Column 5, lines 40-46, Column 6, lines 66-67].

Although Forbes et al. teaches the step of setting a new start date, Forbes et al. does not explicitly set modify the start date specifically because the end date was selected before the start date. However, Official Notice is taken that modifying the most recent input is old and well known in the computing arts. By modifying only the most recent input, users would not be required to re-enter all previous inputs. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the end time when the start date was selected first because doing so would yield a smarter, faster, more efficient interface for event planning.

As per claim 9, Forbes et al. teaches the method of claim 6 further comprising setting the third date in the series as a new start date for the event range **(A user can textually manipulate the timecells to reflect schedule adjustments; Placement of the pointer on the left end of a timebar communicates the intent to change the**

Art Unit: 3623

**start time)** when the third date falls within the event range [Column 5, lines 42-45, Column 6, lines 66-67 Column 8, lines 43-46].

Although Forbes et al. teaches the step of setting a new start date, Forbes et al. does not explicitly set modify the start date specifically because the start date was selected before the end date. However, Official Notice is taken that modifying the initial input is old and well known in the computing arts. By modifying only the initial input, users would not be required to re-enter all subsequent inputs if no modification to said subsequent inputs are required. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the end time when the start date was selected first because doing so would yield a smarter, faster, more efficient interface for event planning.

As per claim 10, Forbes et al. teaches the method of claim 6 further comprising setting the third date in the series as a new end date for the event range when the third date falls within the event range **(A user can textually manipulate the timecells to reflect schedule adjustments; Placement of the pointer on the right end of a timebar communicates the intent to change the end time)** [Column 5, lines 42-45, Column 6, lines 66-67 Column 8, lines 43-46]

Although Forbes et al. teaches the step of setting a new end date, Forbes et al. does not explicitly set modify the end date specifically because the end date was

selected before the start date. However, Official Notice is taken that modifying the initial input is old and well known in the computing arts. By modifying only the initial input, users would not be required to re-enter all subsequent inputs if no modification to said subsequent inputs are required. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the end time when the start date was selected first because doing so would yield a smarter, faster, more efficient interface for event planning.

As per claim 11, Forbes et al. teaches a method for specifying an event range, comprising:

(a) setting a first date and a second date as a start date and an end date for an event range **(user specifies and inputs the start time of the event and an end time to the event)** [Column 8, lines 30-33] based on a chronological relationship between the first date and second date **{the chronological relationship between the start and end time of a single event is evident in that one time is the start time of said event, chronologically occurring prior to the end time of said event. It is understood that chronologically, one time/date occurs prior to the other time/date; thus, the first occurring time/date for an event is the start date, as a result of the chronological relationship with the other (end) time/date for an event. In Forbes, the determination of the chronological relationship between the start and end times is required in order for the user to input the start and end times of an event. Thus, when the user inputs the start time, the chronological relationship**

**between two times has already been compared (the time that occurs first chronologically is the “start” date); in other words, the comparison has been made prior to the inputting of the start and end date by the user};**

(b) **presenting information reflecting the event range (By specifying a timescale and a starting date for the display, the user would cause the invention to display a series of timebars uniquely identified as representing particular events over a scrollable grid with time increments over the calendar period specified; Display of the provided Gregorian calendar graphically depicts scheduling timeframes as well as identifies days on which events are already scheduled) [Column 8, lines 34-38, 61-64, Figures 1-8]; and**

(c) **enabling a user to modify the presented information by selecting a third date (A user can textually manipulate the timecells to reflect schedule adjustments), wherein the third date is set as a new start date for the event range when the third date falls within the event range (Placement of the pointer on the left end of a timebar communicates the intent to change the start time), and wherein the third date is set as a new end date for the event range when the third date falls within the event range (Placement of the pointer on the right end of a timebar communicates the intent to change the end time) [Column 5, lines 42-45, Column 6, lines 66-67 Column 8, lines 43-46].**

Although Forbes et al. teaches the step of setting a new start date, Forbes et al. does not explicitly set modify the start date specifically because the start date was

Art Unit: 3623

selected before the end date. However, Official Notice is taken that modifying the initial input is old and well known in the computing arts. By modifying only the initial input, users would not be required to re-enter all subsequent inputs if no modification to said subsequent inputs are required. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the end time when the start date was selected first because doing so would yield a smarter, faster, more efficient interface for event planning.

Although Forbes et al. teaches the step of setting a new end date, Forbes et al. does not explicitly set modify the end date specifically because the end date was selected before the start date. However, Official Notice is taken that modifying the initial input is old and well known in the computing arts. By modifying only the initial input, users would not be required to re-enter all subsequent inputs if no modification to said subsequent inputs are required. Therefore, it would have been an obvious matter to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the end time when the start date was selected first because doing so would yield a smarter, faster, more efficient interface for event planning.

Claims 15-16 recite limitations already addressed by the rejection of claims 4-5 (setting new start or end dates for an event) and 12 (monthly calendar interface allowing users to specify event ranges and present information reflecting the event range) above; therefore, the same rejection applies.

**Conclusion**


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Choi whose telephone number is (571) 272 6971. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PC

July 3, 2007

  
TARIQ R. HAFIZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600